

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on July 11, 2008.

Claims 8, 15, and 21 are amended; claims 1-7 were previously canceled, without prejudice to the Applicant; as a result, claims 8-24 are now pending in this application.

Example support for the claimed amendments may be found throughout the original filed specification. By way of example only, the Examiner's attention is directed to the original filed specification paragraphs 7, 18, 22, 26-29, and 40-41.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 8-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking adequate description or enablement. The Examiner has asserted that the usage of "new" in front of "search" is unsupported by the original filed specification. Although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner on this point, the independent claims have been amended to include a "modified search," which clearly is supported throughout the original filed specification. As an example, the Examiner's attention is directed to paragraphs 7 and 26-29. Thus, the specific language used in the specification is now called out in the claims. As such, this rejection is no longer appropriate and should be withdrawn.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 8-12, 15-18 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dettinger et al. (U.S. 7,003,730; hereinafter "Dettinger") in view of Guha (U.S. 5,895,465). To sustain an obviousness rejection, each and every element in the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references.

The proposed combination lacks any teaching or suggestion of a teaching where the control field is used as a filter and second search on the original search results to perform a join or a merge that is then used to look for identical values appearing in the search results for the control field. Thus, the rejections of record should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Claims 13 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dettinger in view of Guha, as applied to claims 8-12, 15-18 and 21 above, further in view of DeLorme et al. (U.S. 5,948,040; hereinafter "DeLorme"). These claims are dependent from amended independent claims; therefore, for the amendments and remarks presented above with respect to these independent claims, the rejections of claims 13 and 22-24 should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Claims 14 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dettinger in view of Guha, as applied to claims 8-12, 15-18 and 21 above, further in view of Chakraborti et al. (U.S. 6,334,131; hereinafter "Chakraborti"). These claims are dependent from amended independent claims; therefore, for the amendments and remarks presented above with respect to these independent claims, the rejections of claims 14 and 1-20 should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4370.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(513) 942-0224

Date 10/13/08

By Joseph P. Mehrle
Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 13th day of October, 2008.

Ryan Saunders
Name

[Signature]
Signature